

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

New claims 21 and 22 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found at least in FIG. 4 and the corresponding description in the specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-13, 15-17, 19 and 20-22 are now pending in this application.

### *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,579 to Leymann et al (“Leymann”) and U.S. 2003/0055668 to Saran et al. (“Saran”).<sup>1</sup> Claims 4, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leymann in view of Saran and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0203696 to Jijina et al (“Jijina”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The references cited in the rejection of the claims do not disclose at least the feature of claim 1 of “contents reproduction control means for controlling the reproduction of said contents contained in said aggregate based on ordinal data associated with said aggregate, for which the output thereof has been designated with said aggregate output control means, among said ordinal data having described therein the reproduction order of said contents associated with each of said aggregates.”

Leymann discloses a process model of a workflow-management system. Leymann discloses in column 4 a process model, which include process activities, and a flow of control which determines the sequence in which the activities are executed (col. 4, lines 12-34). The results of an activity are put in an output container, each activity is additionally associated

---

<sup>1</sup> The Patent Office on page 4, item 2 quotes section 103, but on page 4, item 3, indicates the rejection is under section 102. Further, in the body of the rejection on pages 2-12, the Patent Office argues that the claims are obvious in view of Leymann and Saran, and thus suggests the rejection is under section 103. For the purposes of this reply, applicants presume the Examiner intended to reject claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 under section 103. Clarification is requested.

with an input container with input data, and each container is defined by a data structure which is an ordered list of variables (col. 4, lines 35-45). Data connectors represent the transfer of data from the output containers to the input containers (col. 4, lines 45-50).

Leymann, however, does not disclose the feature of claim 1 of “contents reproduction control means for controlling the reproduction of said contents contained in said aggregate based on ordinal data associated with said aggregate, for which the output thereof has been designated with said aggregate output control means, among said ordinal data having described therein the reproduction order of said contents associated with each of said aggregates.” Leymann merely discloses that its process model has a sequence of activities where data is transmitted between activities. Defining a process model to have a sequence of activities is not the same as controlling the reproduction of those activities based on ordinal data. While the activities are performed in a certain order, Leymann does not disclose reproducing the activities as content in a certain order. Moreover, in Leymann, the transfer of results from one activity as input data to a next activity is also not the same as controlling the reproduction of contents in an aggregate based on ordinal data, where the ordinal data describes the reproduction order. Leymann merely discloses transferring result data from an activity to be input data of a next activity, not reproducing contents of a contents aggregate in a reproduction order. Indeed, Leymann is not concerned with reproducing contents of an aggregate per se, but merely in controlling process flow.

Saran and Jijina were cited for disclosing other features of the claims, but fail to cure the deficiencies of Leymann.

Independent claims 12, 13, 15-17, 19 and 20 have features corresponding to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and are patentable for analogous reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, new claims 21 and 22 respectively recite “a player configured to reproduce said contents contained in said aggregate in reproduction order based on control by said contents reproduction control means,” and “at least one of an image output unit configured to output

an image, or a voice output unit player configured to output a sound, based on contents output from said player," features not disclosed by Leymann.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 23, 2011

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438